

Exhibit 40

(Filed Under Seal)

whitepaper

FICO

Business Rule Management Systems Strategy Assessment and Recommendations

Prepared for:



**CHUBB GROUP
OF INSURANCE COMPANIES**

March 29, 2011

DELIVERABLE DOCUMENTATION

Prepared for, and delivered to Chubb & Son on March 31, 2011

Pursuant to Statement of Work Change Orders Nos. 04 and 05
of the Appendix 2, Statement of Work dated November 11, 2009,
by and between Chubb & Son and Fair Isaac Corporation,

a.k.a. 2010 Retainer Agreement

Prepared by:

FICO™

901 Marquette Avenue
Suite 3200,
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
USA

Tel: +1 (612) 758 5200

Fax: +1 (612) 758 5201

E-mail: info@fico.com
www.fico.com



© 2011 Fair Isaac Corporation. All rights reserved. No part of this paper may be reproduced, transmitted, or disclosed in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, for any purpose without the express written permission of Fair Isaac.

www.fico.com

Make every decision count™

Confidential

FED000205_0001



table of contents

1	Executive Summary	7
1.1	Overview	7
1.1.1	FICO Company Profile	8
1.1.2	Overview of Blaze Advisor	9
1.1.3	FICO Team	12
1.2	Overview of Content	14
1.2.1	BRMS Value Statement	14
1.2.2	BRMS in Personal Lines Insurance Industry	14
1.2.3	FICO's Methodology for Decision Harvesting	15
1.2.4	Rule Taxonomy Recommendations for CPI	16
1.2.5	Personal Lines Use Cases	16
1.2.6	Business Rule Lifecycle Management	17
2	Business Rule Management System (BRMS) Value Statement	19
2.1	Overview	19
2.2	BRMS Value to the Enterprise	19
2.2.1	BRMS Value to the Application SDLC	20
2.2.2	BRMS Value to the Business	21
2.2.3	BRMS Value to IT	22
2.2.4	BRMS Value Assessment	22
2.3	Benefits vs. Added Complexities for the Business Community	25
2.3.1	BRMS Elevator Speech for Business	25
2.3.2	Business Challenges/Drivers for BRMS Capabilities	25
2.3.3	Benefits for the Business Communities	26
2.3.4	Added Complexities for the Business Communities	27
2.4	Benefits vs. Added Complexities for the IT Community	27
2.4.1	BRMS Elevator Speech for IT	28
2.4.2	Technology Challenges/Drivers for BRMS Technologies	28
2.4.3	Benefits for the IT Communities	28
2.4.4	Added Complexities for the IT Communities	30
2.5	ROI and Value throughout the BRMS Application Lifecycle	30
2.5.1	BRMS Industry Assertions about Reducing the Cost of Development	31
2.5.2	Reinvest the Value from Faster Development into Better Development	31
2.6	FICO Recommended Future Strategies for Decision Management at Chubb	32
2.6.1	Get Rid of the Silos	32
2.6.2	Bring Equations to the Planning Table	33
2.6.3	All-points fraud protection	33
3	BRMS in Personal Line Insurance Industry Overview	34
3.1	Overview	34
3.2	Current Trends for BRMS in the Insurance Industry	34
3.2.1	Case Studies of BRMS at Some Major Personal Lines Insurance Carriers	35
3.3	Historical Successes—Things That Make BRMS Successful	37
3.3.1	Select the Right Application	38
3.3.2	Follow a Methodology	39
3.3.3	Document, Document, Document	39
3.3.4	Manage Traceability	40
3.3.5	Manage Business Rule Quality	40
3.3.6	Choose the Right Metaphor	42
3.3.7	Verify the Business Rules	44
3.3.8	Validate Business Rules	45
3.3.9	Simulate the Business Impact	45
3.3.10	Structure for Reuse and Governance	46
3.3.11	Operationalize Analytics and Improve Decisions	47



3.4	Historical Challenges—Things That Add Risk to BRMS Projects	48
3.4.1	Overview	48
3.4.2	Challenging Domains	48
3.4.3	Challenging Business Requirements	49
3.5	BRMS Application Suitability—Guidelines for Selecting App for BRMS	50
3.5.1	Overview	50
3.5.2	Assessment of Volatility and Complexity of Decisioning	50
3.5.3	Indicators and Contraindications for BRMS	52
3.5.4	Sources of Knowledge	52
3.5.5	Types of Decisioning	54
3.5.6	Types of Functional Requirements	56
4	Overview of FICO's Decision Harvesting Methodology	59
4.1	Overview	59
4.2	FICO's FIRUP Delivery Methodology	60
4.2.1	Iterative Project Management	60
4.2.2	FIRUP Disciplines	62
4.2.3	Key Disciplines for Decision Requirements Analysis	63
4.3	FICO's Decision Harvesting Methodology	70
4.3.1	Decision Requirements Harvesting Techniques	70
4.3.2	Effective Requirement Reviews	76
4.3.3	Qualities of "Good" Requirements	77
4.3.4	Guidelines for Writing Good Requirements	77
4.3.5	Outline Requirements	78
4.3.6	Detail Requirement	79
4.3.7	Identifying Architecturally Significant Requirements	80
4.3.8	FIRUP Guidelines for Conducting a Requirements Workshop	80
4.3.9	Traceability of Decisioning Requirements	83
4.3.10	Review and Approve Requirements	86
4.4	Decision Requirements Analysis	87
4.4.1	Overview of DRA	87
4.4.2	Inputs to DRA	88
4.4.3	Outputs Produced from DRA	88
4.4.4	Preconditions and Triggers	88
4.4.5	Resources and Responsibilities	89
4.4.6	Preparation	89
4.4.7	Process Steps	89
4.5	Decision Requirements Analysis Workshop	90
4.5.1	Resources	90
4.5.2	Scheduling	91
4.5.3	Technique	91
4.5.4	Process	91
4.5.5	Outlining Decision Requirements without DRAW	101
4.6	Decision Requirements Diagram (DRD)	102
4.6.1	Components of a DRD	103
4.6.2	Uses of the DRD	104
4.7	Decision Definition Document (DDD)	106
4.7.1	Purpose and Scope	106
4.7.2	Description of Major Sections	106
4.8	Supporting Requirements Document	110
4.8.1	Supporting Requirements Categories	111
4.9	Decision Harvesting (a.k.a., Rule Harvesting)	115
4.9.1	Resources and Responsibilities	116
4.9.2	Inputs	116
4.9.3	Outputs	117
4.9.4	Preparation	117
4.9.5	Process Steps	117
4.9.6	Capture and Document the Rules	117
4.9.7	Capture and Document the Business Terms associated with each Rule	118



4.9.8	Capture and Document Decision Dependencies	120
4.9.9	Capture and Document Abstractions	121
4.9.10	Analyze Rules for Consistency, Completeness and Redundancies	122
4.9.11	Review and Obtain Approval/Sign-off on Rules	122
4.10	Decision Harvesting Workbooks	123
4.10.1	Purpose and Scope	123
4.10.2	Business Term Catalog	123
4.10.3	Decision Dependencies Worksheet	124
4.10.4	Generic Rule Worksheet	124
4.10.5	Structured Rule Worksheet	124
4.10.6	Computation Worksheet	125
4.10.7	Abstraction Worksheet	125
4.11	Ancillary Rule Harvesting Activities and Artifacts	125
4.11.1	Unit Test Requirements Definition	126
4.11.2	User Acceptance Test (UAT) Requirements Definition	126
4.11.3	Rule Maintenance and Extension Requirements	127
4.11.4	RMA Requirements	127
4.11.5	Reporting, Logging, Audit, and Traceability Requirements	128
5	Rule Mining Recommendations for CPI Print and Underwriting	129
5.1.1	Manual Rule-Mining Recommendations	129
5.2	Overview of Rule Mining	130
5.2.1	Business Rule Mining vs. Association Rule Mining	130
5.3	Business Rule Mining Process Steps	130
5.3.1	Define Project Goals and Desired Outputs	131
5.3.2	Select Rule Mining Technology	131
5.3.3	Define Project Approach and Time/Resources Allocation	133
5.3.4	Define Rule Mining Workflow	134
5.3.5	Determine Business Processes Mapping and Alignment	134
5.3.6	Perform Application Analysis	135
5.3.7	Define Business Term Catalog	136
5.3.8	Define Rule Taxonomy	136
5.3.9	Mine Business Rule Requirements (a.k.a., Candidate Rules)	137
5.3.10	Verify and Validate Candidate Rules	140
5.3.11	Transform Business Rule Requirements	141
5.3.12	Reports Production	143
5.3.13	Integration with a Target Environment	143
5.3.14	Proactively Manage Rules	144
5.4	Rule Mining Recommendations for Chubb	145
5.4.1	Some Rules of Thumb about Rule Mining	145
5.4.2	Manual Rule-Mining Recommendations	146
5.4.3	Subject-matter Experts (SME)	147
5.4.4	Subject-matter Expertise Is Needed for Rule Mining	148
6	Rule Taxonomy Recommendations for Chubb Personal Lines (CPI)	150
6.1	Overview	150
6.2	There are Dozens of Rule Taxonomies, and They Aren't All Wrong	150
6.2.1	Enterprise/Organizational Taxonomy vs. BRMS Application/Project Taxonomy	150
6.2.2	Classification vs. Organizational/Structural	153
6.2.3	Taxonomy for the Enterprise or Application/Project	154
6.3	FICO's Approach to Rule Taxonomy	155
6.3.1	Guidelines for Selecting a Rule Taxonomy	155
6.3.2	FICO's Rule Taxonomy	155
6.4	FICO Recommendations for CPI Rule Taxonomy	156
6.4.1	FICO Recommendations for Underwriting Taxonomy	156
6.4.2	FICO Recommendations for Print Taxonomy	156



7	Personal Lines Insurance Rule Use Cases	159
7.1	Overview	159
7.2	BRMS and Underwriting for Personal Lines Insurance	159
7.2.1	New Focus for IT/IS: Revenue Generation	160
7.2.2	Making Revenue-Generating Decisions at Point of Sale	161
7.2.3	Getting a Better Handle on the Channel	163
7.2.4	Multiplying Profits and Markets through More Accurate, Innovative Pricing	164
7.2.5	Facilitating Profitable Renewals	167
7.2.6	Expanding the Market by Tightening the Market	168
7.3	Decision Management is the Next Step	169
8	Business Rule Lifecycle Management	171
8.1	Overview	171
8.2	Blaze Advisor Product Features and Proper BRMS Structure and Design	172
8.2.1	Overview	172
8.2.2	Blaze BRMS Component Structure	173
8.2.3	Blaze Repository Physical Structure	174
8.2.4	Blaze Repository Logical Structure	175
8.2.5	User Authentication and Authorization (A&A)	177
8.2.6	Lifecycle Management for Decision Service	180
8.2.7	Lifecycle Management for Repository Entities	181
8.2.8	Filters	181
8.2.9	Management Properties (Repository Entity Metadata)	183
8.2.10	Difference Query	184
8.2.11	Graphical Difference Tool	186
8.3	FICO's Best Practices for Rule Versioning	187
8.3.1	Overview	187
8.3.2	Version Management System Considerations	188
8.3.3	Versioning Rules, Rulesets, and Decision Metaphors	188
8.3.4	Effective Dating	191
8.4	FICO Best Practices for Business Rule Lifecycle Management (BRLM)	192
8.4.1	Overview	192
8.4.2	Blaze Advisor Product Features for BRLM	192
8.4.3	BRLM Migration Patterns	192
8.4.4	BRLM Use Case	195
8.4.5	Real-world Considerations—Balancing Governance and Business Agility	198
8.4.6	Impact of SDLC on BRLM	199
8.4.7	Summary	200
8.5	FICO Lifecycle Management Service Framework	200
8.5.1	Overview	200
8.5.2	FICO Lifecycle Management Console Walkthrough	207
8.5.3	FICO Lifecycle Management Lifecycle Database	223
8.5.4	Lifecycle Management Rule Service	233
8.5.5	Best Practices and Considerations	245
8.6	The "Maker – Checker" Approach	247
8.6.1	Overview	247
8.6.2	"Maker—Checker" Approach	248
8.6.3	Sample "Maker—Checker" Use Case	248
8.6.4	Best Practices and Design Considerations	248
8.6.5	Issues and Design Considerations with Sample Use Case	249
8.7	FICO Recommendations for CPI Rule Management	250
8.7.1	Overview	250
8.7.2	Review of Onsite Findings	250
8.7.3	FICO Recommendations for Chubb Enterprise	255
8.7.4	FICO Recommendations for Underwriting Rule Management	257
8.7.5	FICO Recommendations for Print Rule Management	257
8.7.6	FICO Recommendations for Chubb Specialty Lines	257



Attachments and Additional References	258
COBIT Management Strategies Whitepaper	258
Notices/ Disclaimers	259
Confidentiality	259
Agreement	259
Validity	259
Trademarks	259



Speed	Manual decision-making has reduced by 80%. Automated decisions are in real time.	1
Cost	Through underwriting automation, CSAA has nullified the practice of continually hiring additional underwriters to keep up with the demand. Through BRMS and sharing services, the cost of maintaining the underwriting decisioning has reduced by 75%	2
Total Score:		8

As said above, the total score will be normalized between 0 and 10. That score can be used to gauge the value received by the project, organization, or enterprise relative to the BRMS industry in general.

Table 4—Quantified Description for BRMS Value Assessment Scores

Score	Value Assessment Relative to BRMS Industry
10	<i>A Perfect BRMS Implementation/Organization.</i> Receiving a 10 means that both Business and IT realized value on each of the 5 assessment criteria. While theoretically possible, in practice this score is not expected.
9	<i>Extraordinary Value.</i> This is an exceptional score and it indicates that the Business and IT communities are realizing more value than the methodology expects. Only the most mature BRMS organizations are capable of producing individual projects that score in this region.
8	<i>Very High Value.</i> This score puts the implementation or organization in the top 5%. This is the target score in this methodology. In a "methodology-perfect" BRMS implementation or an ideal adoption of BRMS for an organization or enterprise, it is not practical to expect every community to realize full value in all 5 assessment criteria. Assuming a realistic handful of 0.5 scores, the practical target score is an 8.
6-to-7	<i>High Value.</i> This score puts the implementation or organization in the top 25%. Regardless of whether this is a project or an organizational assessment, the organization is clearly realizing a substantial amount of value from BRMS.
5	<i>Normal Value.</i> The realized value certainly justified the investment in BRMS. There is room for improvement. However, no one will be regarding the project as being unsuccessful. This would be a realistic target score for a first endeavour in BRMS.
3-to-4	<i>Marginal Value.</i> The net return will likely offset the investment in BRMS. However, the project is not likely to be regarded by the organization as being successful.
0-to-2	<i>Little to No Value.</i> A fair assessment would conclude that the project or organization failed to realize any substantial value from BRMS.



2.3 Benefits vs. Added Complexities for the Business Community

The goal of this section is to provide Chubb's business communities with a foundation for the open discussion of the relative benefits they can expect from BRMS so they can weigh those against the added complexities. The subsections cover:

1. BRMS Elevator Speech for Business
2. Business Challenges/Drivers for BRMS Capabilities
3. Benefits for the Business Communities
4. Added Complexities for the Business Communities

2.3.1 BRMS Elevator Speech for Business

A BRMS or Business Rule Management System is a software system used to define, deploy, execute, monitor and maintain the variety and complexity of decision logic that is used by operational systems within an organization or enterprise. This logic, also referred to as business rules, includes policies, requirements, and conditional statements that are used to determine the tactical actions that take place in applications and systems.

A BRMS includes, at minimum:

- A repository, allowing decision logic to be externalized from core application code
- Tools, allowing both technical developers and business experts to define and manage decision logic
- A runtime environment, allowing applications to invoke decision logic managed within the BRMS and execute it using a business rules engine

The top benefits of a BRMS include:

- Reduced or removed reliance on IT departments for changes in live systems. Although, QA and Rules testing would still be needed in any enterprise system.
- Increased control over implemented decision logic for compliance and better business management
- The ability to express decision logic with increased precision, using a business vocabulary syntax and graphical rule representations (decision tables, trees, scorecards and flows)
- Improved efficiency of processes through increased decision automation

2.3.2 Business Challenges/Drivers for BRMS Capabilities

The Business community's needs for Decision Management spring from the increasing complexity of making decisions:

- Decisions that once took days now have to be made at the speed of the transaction; such as while your customer is completing an online transaction.
- Business objectives used to be simpler and set at the local level—now those objectives involve trade-offs between risk, resource constraints, opportunity costs and other factors.
- The data available to make decisions has ballooned, but there are challenges to using all that data effectively.
- Compliance with more new regulations, stricter and more complex rules, shorter deadlines and greater consequences for non-compliance.



- Need to change customer treatment strategies more frequently and more rapidly to deal with competitive forces, environmental changes and changes in the customer base.
- Decisions that were once "owned" by a single group are "shared" by multiple departments, and have to be coordinated across channels and regions.
- Customers expect the same treatment regardless of channel, and they expect that the treatment is consistent with the value of their relationship.
- You used to be able to handle decisions requiring manual review processes—now the volume makes that impractical.

2.3.3 Benefits for the Business Communities

The main benefit that BRMS brings to the business communities is the elimination of many challenges or barriers that are inherent to traditional software implementations.

1. It is very expensive to operate within the confines of a traditional SDLC. The business community has to dedicate a large budget to operationalizing business decisions that are typically not overly complex.
2. While important to the integrity of an organization's IT infrastructure, the rigor of a traditional SDLC is inherently burdensome on business. The time it takes to implement changes to business software is an impediment to speed and agility.
3. The traditional SDCL focuses on the implementation of individual business software applications that are purpose-built for specific needs. They are standalone. But business processes overlap. This leads not only to redundancy but also to inconsistency in the implementation of decisioning throughout an organization.
4. The communication of Business requirements in the traditional SDLC is akin to the children's game of "Whisper Down the Lane" (a.k.a., "Pass the Message" or "Telephone"): The business communicates its functional requirements to a business analyst who analyzes them and communicates specifications to an architect who designs a solution and gives specifications to a developer who implements them... and then back to the business who tests the system and tells everyone they got it all wrong. This is a very imprecise approach to communicating requirements within an organization.

The above are more than just annoyances; these side effects of the traditional SDLC cost the business \$MM every year. Therefore, the real benefit to business is a reduction or elimination of losses that result from a business's inability to be precise, consistent and agile in its decisioning. These include:

1. Lost revenue from imprecise decisions. Companies leave value on the table by making less targeted, less relevant decisions. For example, pricing insurance in one of three tiers when underwriting new customers will lead to lower profit per customer than a segmentation of 20 tiers—or even continuous pricing tailored to each customer.
2. Lost value through operational negation. Without systems that enforce consistency and connect decisions, businesses often make one set of decisions that negates the value created in another set of decisions. For example, the marketing department may attract customers that are unprofitable.
3. Lost share through falling behind the pace of change. When it takes weeks or months to change an offer, a pricing structure or a decision strategy, businesses cannot adapt fast enough to changes in consumer behavior or competitive offers. This leads to share erosion.

In addition to these financial benefits, other practical or tactical benefits of BRMS to the business community include:

1. Business Control—Business rules can be modified by business users, in a controlled, auditable manner that is cohesive and consistent across applications.



2. Flexible and Consistent Workforce—all company staff and all of the agents who act for a company treat customers consistently and according to the best practices identified.
3. Learning Environment—Business users and analysts can rapidly improve and evolve their decision logic by more quickly deploying new rules and models and by learning at a faster pace through continual feedback and champion/challenger strategy testing.

2.3.4 Added Complexities for the Business Communities

Nothing is free, so what are the costs for realizing the benefits described above?

- There is no technology purchase; Chubb owns an enterprise license to Blaze Advisor. So, what would normally be the first concern on the list is not a concern for Chubb.
- The business community will need to make time to participate in JAD sessions with business analysts from the IT community. These sessions will be frequent, non-trivial, and will last roughly the first 2/3 of the SDLC. However, the ROI that comes from taking a JAD approach to the implementation of BRMS is exceptionally high.
- The business community will need to undergo DRAW training.
- The business community will need to make a commitment to enhance their existing requirements analysis methodology with several key activities associated with Decision Requirements Analysis (DRA). This includes active participation in the following aspects of Decision Requirements Analysis:
 - Acting as subject-matter experts (SME) during the DRAW
 - Acting as subject-matter experts (SME) and providing elaboration on decisioning requirements during the Harvesting effort
 - Elaborating on RMA requirements
 - Elaborating on requirements for unit-test, acceptance-test, and regression-test suites
 - Approval/sign-off on decisioning requirements produced by DRA
- Collaboration with business analysts from IT in the specification of a rule maintenance and extension strategy. And, corollarily, participating in rule maintenance and extension as agreed upon in that strategy.

Business community participation (outside of business analysts, who are IT) on mid-scale projects typically amounts to approximately 1 FTE over the first 2/3 of the SDLC. Involvement will be higher to start and then taper off to cycles of moderate involvement separated by periods of light involvement.

2.4 Benefits vs. Added Complexities for the IT Community

The goal of this section is to provide Chubb's IT communities with a foundation for the open discussion of the relative benefits they can expect from BRMS so they can weigh those against the added complexities. The subsections cover

1. BRMS Elevator Speech for IT
2. Technology Challenges/Drivers for BRMS Technologies
3. Benefits for the IT Communities
4. Added Complexities for the IT Communities



2.4.1 BRMS Elevator Speech for IT

A BRMS provides a complete rules environment that allows complex business decisions to be abstracted from hard-coded applications, Web pages, straight-through processes, or composite applications. In doing so it increases the stability and code quality of the higher-level object, ensures the consistency of application of business policy across the enterprise, and enables greater responsiveness to change. It provides visibility and audit of automated decisions in a manner that is meaningful to business users and IT staff alike.

A BRMS provides a high-performance runtime environment for .NET, Java, Service Oriented Architecture (SOA), or legacy applications and features strong change management through its rules repository. It can form part of a more comprehensive enterprise-level Decision Management (DM) strategy, or simply satisfy the tactical need for greater manageability of variable business logic.

2.4.2 Technology Challenges/Drivers for BRMS Technologies

The traditional approach to application architecture is to embed all the decision-making logic within hard-coded applications. At face value this provides the simplest and lowest-overhead architecture, but in fact leads to a number of serious disadvantages:

- Changes to the logic can only be carried out by a programmer, and the consequent new version of the application has to pass through all of the testing and acceptance procedures before it can be deployed, owing to a greatly prolonged change cycle.
- Where the same logic is required in multiple applications there is a real danger that changes will not be made consistently, leading to variations on the anticipated system behavior. This is a particular concern where the same decision logic is required to be implemented within different application styles – e.g., .NET, Java, and COBOL.
- It is very complex to audit the decision-making process to determine why any particular transaction took the course it did.
- The code cannot be presented to business decision makers in a form that enables them to check the logic is as required.
- Very complex decisions are notoriously difficult to code in an efficient manner, and the actual runtime performance may be inadequate. Organizations often resort to manual decision making even though it would be possible to define the rules.

The solution increasingly being adopted is to deploy a Business Rules Management System (BRMS) as a single point for managing all decision logic. Chubb has standardized on the Blaze Advisor BRMS product from FICO.

2.4.3 Benefits for the IT Communities

In general, the one benefit that IT looks for in any technology or methodology is “does it make us more productive?” IT needs to implement solutions and maintain systems/applications as efficiently and effectively as possible. This section will examine the benefits of BRMS from that perspective.

The aim of Blaze Advisor is to provide a single point of decision management at the enterprise level. The primary features that enable this strategy are:

- The ability to create rules and rule sets to resolve complex decisions, while presenting the logic in an intuitive manner that can be understood and modified by business or IT staff.
- Development Productivity—Business rules are built and maintained once, not replicated in fragmented systems.
- Deployment across a heterogeneous environment, including deployment to client-side Web forms.